

MAN!

"Man is the measure-
ment of everything."

If There Is Anything That Cannot Bear Free Thought--Let It Crack--WENDELL PHILLIPS

Vol. 7.—No. 4

Administration and Editorial Address:
P. O. Box 971, Los Angeles, Calif.

Los Angeles, Calif., April, 1939

1 (481)

Single Copy 5 Cents

CAN THE PEOPLE END THE GAME OF WAR?

When the schemes of all the systems,
kingdoms and republics fail.
Something kindler, higher, holier—
all for one and one for all.

—Alfred TENNYSON

It seems that the rulers of the world are literally translating into action the words of the Roman historian Tacitus who once said: "Even war is better than a wretched peace." For, no one can deny that the black demon known as War is hovering over the world today. No one dares to think yet each dares to silently and inwardly hope that the imminent cloud of War will not burst upon us. In fact, at this moment another small piece of Europe has been ferociously swallowed and devoured by one of the gullible mad men who rule Europe. The world is hoping against hope that war will not be waged while the master men are brewing the pot of war which will devastate the world.

In reality, it is an arduous task to try to analyze the world situation at the present time. The map of Europe is being changed from one day to the next. At any moment we may read the splashing headlines telling the story in a few words, a story of more plunder and pillage, the story marking the beginning of a new war. And most people, although showing signs of relief, will be somewhat disappointed if they do not soon hear the words WAR DECLARED broadcast over their radios and spread out across the headline of the daily papers. I say that most people will be disappointed because every agency of propaganda—the radio, newspaper, movies, schools and other agents of the governments—have already keyed up the populations of the various countries to the point where they expect and might want war. Yes, this is a daring statement, but it is nevertheless true.

This fact notwithstanding, those of us who have the courage to think seriously and sensibly in these hectic days of war hysteria, are almost forced to look at the international situation with an attitude of hopelessness and an earnest desire to close our eyes and ears to what is going on around us. Yet, some of us know that out of this chaos, out of this hectic hysteria may rise high and wide the noble hope for a bright and hopeful tomorrow; out of this great madness may blossom the flower of a real and everlasting peace for all. And it is with this attitude that we examine with eagerness the chaos of today. After the storm may come the rainbow; after the flood may come the flow of serene waters.

Twenty-one years ago, on November 11, an armistice was declared to end the greatest and most disastrous war of all times. The World War was called "the war to end wars." It was started because a single shot was fired. And it was stopped only after millions had been killed or wounded, only after the world was exhausted—and the financiers backing the enterprise had made enough profit for the time being.

Today, twenty-five years after the first shot was fired to begin the World War, the powers that be are preparing a more devastating, a more disastrous, a more barbaric human slaughter. Historians and statisticians have recorded the fatalities and the costs of the last war. It is not necessary or possible for us to repeat them here. Suffice it to say that at some time or other each of us has read or will read these statistics. But these bold figures telling the story of the lives lost and the money spent from 1914 to 1918 will never heal the wound of the old mother who lost her sons in that carnage. Those cold figures will never bring warmth to hearts of the wives who lost their dear ones in that massacre of man by man. Those figures will serve to point out more clearly the

barbarism of the tyrants who have been and are the few who rule the world. Those figures, moreover, will serve to guide the rulers to come, those who bring about war, those who are planning to profit by a new and bigger war.

What has been going on since 1918? No sooner had the ruins of the last war settled on international soil than the powers of the world, indirectly later, began to prepare for another war. And paradoxically enough the word most frequently used during all this time by the forerunners and determiners of war has been the word peace. Tragically enough, too, all the agents of the powerful, false and perfidious propaganda spread by those who say peace and mean war aim their tirades at the youth of the world, the youth which will be the target of the war now in its embryonic stage. This is a psychological well-prepared scheme and maneuver on the part of the infamous body of riff-raff known as diplomats of the world. They are weaving a tight and far-reaching net whereby they are aiming to entrap the youth. And what more can be expected? After all, a war is merely

another financial enterprise for those who sit at the diplomatic tables and make the moves in the game of international checkerboard. What does it matter to them that a starving mother is torn away from her son whose hopeful dreams of a tomorrow, of a bright future are suddenly and completely shattered by the whims and desires of the financial scalpers who, feeling their bankroll slipping away and eager to maintain their prestige in the domestic and foreign markets, decide that now is the best time to have another war?

I do not think we are making a mistake when we say that during the last twenty years—with peace the keynote word of every government—each and every government of the world in some way or other has assisted in and abetted the fomenting of another war. This instigation and preparation has had many outlets during all this time. It has manifested itself in the very set-up of fascism in Europe. I say set-up because the dictators of Europe have always had the full sanction and approval of those governments which still label themselves "democratic." At the same time, this preparation for war is manifesting itself in the mad race for naval, military and aeronautic supremacy. In this scramble and wild game we are witnessing an undreamed of rapidity and speeding up of the manufacture of war materials and munitions.

As a result, we find that during the last five years there has been continuous bloodshed on some battlefield in Europe. First it was Ethiopia. And Great Britain, France, the United States and Russia sat back and let the bulldog-faced Italian take over Ethiopia. Not a word was spoken, not a move was made—in spite of propaganda to the contrary—to halt this mad scoundrel in his acts of vandalism. Worse than that, a policy of appeasement was sounded by the great "democracies."

Then came Spain. Too much has been written about the Spanish tragedy, yet not enough has been said to expose the bold infamy of the "great democracies" and of Soviet Russia for their shameless and ruthless attitude toward the Spanish struggle. If the historians of the future intend to record the Spanish tragedy accurately and sincerely, they will have to condemn the democracies and Russia more than they will the dictators and will have to hold the former responsible for the victory of Franco. Mussolini and Hitler never feigned to be neutral. But the "democracies" and Russia, under the pretense of neutrality, made possible the triumph of fascism in Spain. These responsible governments called the Spanish conflict a civil war and under this nomenclature justified their "non-intervention" policy. Yet, all of them know that had the war in Spain been a civil war, the conflict would have been of short duration. And the people of Spain would have been victorious. Those of us who saw in it the uprising of a whole population ready to shed its last drop of blood for its freedom, those of us who understood the sacrifices, which the Iberian people were making, hailed the Spanish conflict as the beginning of the Social Revolution. And we were not mistaken, for the people of Spain—the Spanish peasants and toilers—were fighting for their freedom, were sacrificing their all for the cause of the Social Revolution. But the tables were turned, and the first signs of compromise—on the part of liberals, communists, socialists and some of the anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists in Spain—marked the beginning of the downward trend of the Social Revolution. This, together with the false behavior of the "democracies" of the world who were indirectly

Will Motherhood Bring Another Sacrifice?



Drum Beat

The time is ripe for fife and drum and marching men,
A mortal tread the very earth has learned to beat,
A fateful measure echoed back from mountains when
Troy had not yet been choked by dust of soldiers' feet.
War! War! And war! A holy war! Go forth and kill!
Gods do not care! They have grown merry over death.
The wise and sick old men prate in their councils still—
Dominion of the State means more than youth and
(breath.)

No blunt apology of greed. The wild cries start,
Affirming proud crusade in contest never won.
Man turns again to cut away his own hot heart.
Old Abraham goes forth to sacrifice his son.

Sara Bundy PENCE

The Dead Men Walk

(Easter Parade, Commonwealth Avenue, Boston)
Appropriately, the celebrants today
wear undertaker's garb, and it is very
fitting the faces too should be slate-gray
stones from an old New England cemetery.

Kenneth PORTER

Exhaltation

Let not the misty poppies bleeding red
Destroy your eagerness; let not the cry
Of winds that whisper to the rotting dead
Suppress your eagerness; you do not die
Who die for Fatherland, for you live long
In DuPont's limbo. John Morgan does not
Forget the boys; he sings a tender song
For you at Easter time. You shall not rot!

David WHITE

FREEDOM AND GOVERNMENT

working with Hitler and Mussolini, made a fascist victory possible. More than that, the interwoven agreements between the dictatorships and the democracies prove to the world that the work of the dictators has been approved and sanctioned by the democracies and has been blessed by the holy waters of the Roman papacy. The nationalist government of Spain was recognized by the democracies of Europe and as soon as the victory of Franco was announced to the world. And Pope Pius XII, in congratulating Franco on his fascist victory, said: "Raising our hearts to God, we thank Him and your Excellency for the desired victory of Catholic Spain and pray that this beloved country, having found peace, may renew with vigor her ancient christian traditions which made her so great." He must indeed be a cruel God or a very irresponsible God if he can be held responsible and thanked by dictators and democrats alike!

And on another battlefield China and Japan are engaged in an undeclared war of imperialism. Again, the great "democratic" rulers look on while the financiers gloat over the fact that their profits and interests become greater and greater—as armed conflict increases.

Then came the greatest tragic comedy of them all—the "peace at Munich." Great Britain and France, with the United States and Russia, had just given their approval to a fascist victory in the Spanish struggle which was in its final stage. So, they decided to appease the world by calling the farcical four-power conference at Munich. Hitler was given the Sudetenland with the great Skoda munitions plant; Great Britain and France were given Hitler's guarantee of "peace" while Mussolini, who brought the papal blessing to the conference, also promised peace like his brother Hitler did. They all went home happy for having their constituents believe that they had saved the peace of the world. All went well for some six months—until the fanatic German decided to plunder and literally take Czechoslovakia. And things have been going on at a rapid pace since then. Mussolini did not want to see his partner and pupil get ahead of him; so he took Albania. And now Chamberlain is worried because Franco has signed a military agreement with Italy, and nationalist Spain will go to the aid of Italy in the advent of a war. What did Chamberlain expect anyway? Is he tired of playing the game or is he feigning to forget the rules? Russia has all her troops mobilized, and Great Britain is ready to go to the aid of Poland. Italy and Germany have their eyes on Turkey and Greece. France is also worried because she seems to be surrounded on all sides by dictatorships. Imagine! Two great powers like Chamberlain and Daladier are worried about the vandalism of two men! Would they have us believe that?

And the United States, also pulling on the strings which are holding the bag of war, is keeping pace with Europe. Huge sums of money have been appropriated for "national defense," the neutrality act is being amended. And the latest news is that this country is anxious to sell arms on cash and carry basis and barter with some of the other democracies.

Thus, we see that the puzzling game of war, with its entangled rules, is being played by every government of the world. Perhaps the most surprising piece of news emanates from Switzerland, the little country that has always been called the free Helvetia, the land whose residents are unmolested. The editor of the anarchist publications "Risveglio Anarchico" and "Réveil Anarchiste" has received a letter from the Federal Council of Switzerland reproaching him for having used, in his publications, words and phrases describing the fascists and nazis, words which according to the Federal Council, "might endanger the favorable relations between Switzerland and the rest of Europe." The letter also states that the publication will be "suspended indefinitely" unless the editor refrains from the use of such words and phrases. The words in question are: rabble, numskull, brigands, beasts. We know that dictators prevent their subjects from speaking the truth. The Federal Council of Switzerland, in demanding an anarchist publication in its country to refrain from speaking the truth, is acting hand in hand with the dictators. Also from calm little Switzerland comes the news that last week (April 2, 1939) the little land of freedom alarmed the world by publishing a law conscripting all able-bodied men up to 60 for military service. She has also created an auxiliary unit in which women, and men unable to fight, may enlist.

This is a brief analysis of what has been going on in this civilized world, this world of 20th century barbarism. It is not necessary to say much on the subject. The facts speak for themselves. Suffice it to say that it is all a very unpleasant and painful situation.

* * *

Until now I have tried to show how the game of war is played by the diplomats and the financiers. But we know that this game cannot be played at all unless the war fomenters are sure that the people will fight for them. And will the people fight in the event of a war? I am afraid that they will, for they are being blindly misled into a war by the rabid perfidious propaganda which surrounds them. They will wage the war for their masters because they are told that the war will safeguard democracy and bring economic security to all.

No, do not be misled into believing them. They made you fight in the last war which they called "a

The following article, written eight years ago, throws light upon the polemics that arose upon the participation of Anarchists in the Spanish government. It was published during the few revolutionary days in Montevideo in which some comrades, deported from Argentina by the dictator, Uriburu, (among them Santillan), took part.

The study we intend to make will contribute towards solving the revolution's various problems through libertarian means. If to start with, we affirm that authority (which is dictatorship) is necessary to obtain such solutions, we at once admit that such problems cannot be solved by libertarian means; and in that case it is useless for us to call ourselves Anarchists, since Anarchy could be only a Utopia.

But personally I don't believe that, and consequently I remain an Anarchist.

Thus let us study the following problems: economic and cultural reconstruction, and the armed defense of the revolution against the internal and external enemies. If our study should prove to us that no step forward could be made without making use of authority, then we should have to acknowledge that we have been wrong. Until now such a fact has not been demonstrated.

I have heard comrades speak of "visible and invisible dictatorship"; let us have a clear understanding about the meaning of these words. Dictatorship is a political factor, it implies the existence of an absolute government led by a single individual who through force, compels all others to obey. Such dictatorship cannot be invisible. The invisible one, according to Bakunin, (who in this case made use of a wrong term) would be the moral influence which no one of us would condemn, since it is not in contradic-

war to end war." And they will make you fight in tomorrow's war—unless—unless you will not fight it for them, unless you refuse to fight in a war for which you never asked while those who ordered a war sit in their spatial palaces and decide what you are to do while they drink over your dead bodies, unless you refuse to abet in the carrying out of any and all wars. But first of all, you must realize that war is the game of tyrants. It is the massacre of man by man; of killing or being killed by people whom you do not know and against whom you have no grievances. You must realize that war is the result of the scheming and speculations of capitalists and political rulers as a means of satisfying their imperialist and financial vanities. War is the result of the common agreement of all capitalists and rulers and of the religious institutions to satisfy their glib ambitions and aspirations. War is the weapon of your rulers, a weapon which they are using against you. It is the weapon of fear. Yes, they are afraid that some day you, too, like the people of Spain, will stand and fight for your rights. They are afraid that you will not always remain as their humble subjects. And because they are afraid of you, they make you fight for them—while you could be fighting for yourselves. You must realize this, and you must realize, too, that you are the invincible force of progress. Without you there can be no war, for you are the ones to manufacture the means with which to carry on a war. You are the builders of bridges and roads; you are the toilers who till the land; you are the miners who dig the coal; you are progress itself. You are humanity. Will you let yourself be killed because someone has ordered so?

* * *

What is the attitude of the anarchist toward war? Naturally, he is against any form of war. The philosophy of anarchism does not admit war as a solution to the problems, trials and tribulations of mankind. This does not mean that the anarchist is for peace—the kind of peace that the world has been "enjoying." No, that is not part of the anarchist philosophy. To this the anarchist will answer now and always: War is the weapon of fear, the tool of tyrants. Through war, Capitalism and the State aim to keep down the voice of the oppressed who are called to fight the wars. War cures nothing. It merely quenches momentarily the unsatiable thirst and greed of the few who foment war. War offers only death, famine, misery, disease and more oppression for those who are called to fight. This does not mean that the anarchist is ready to accept peace as it exists today. No, for even that peace is the result of the plans and schemes of the rulers. The anarchist sees one and only one solution to the ills of humanity—the complete eradication of the roots of the present order of things and the building up of a new society which will spell peace and happiness for all, a society in which war and its weapons will have no place. There may be bloodshed in order to bring this about. But it is the devourers of mankind who are the sole blame, as they maintain their reign only by violence and bloodshed. Today and always in the vanguard of the Social Revolution, stands the anarchist, firm in his convictions, unflinching in his determination, the anarchist ready to be the first to shed his blood for the Social Revolution, for out of that bloodshed will dawn a new life, a new hope, a new tomorrow of real peace.

Ray RANDALL

tion with our ideas—but we refuse to play with words.

Now, we are revolutionaries and evolutionists; we are in favor of violence if it is used to destroy tyranny and to liberate us from oppressive violence. Ours is revolutionary and liberative; today we also accept violence as a means for our defense, —to-morrow for the defense of the revolution.

When, during the revolution, the violence of liberation and defense becomes one of command and strict coercion against others, then it is to be condemned as oppressive.

However, there are some comrades who sincerely believe that this coercive violence is necessary in order to defend the reconstruction of society, and that we must have some form of dictatorship to prevent the enemies from preventing its achievement. If in reality such would be the case, we repeat that Anarchy would only be a Utopia. But to the contrary I believe that it would not be necessary; that in line with anarchist theory it is possible to organize a protective force through the establishment of free associations of defense which would be equipped with necessary armaments.

Surely, the revolution may take an authoritarian direction, still the function of Anarchists would be to represent the liberating forces.

Dictatorship against reaction is fallacious. Indeed, all its opponents, including Anarchists, would always be considered as reactionaries. As an hypothetical case let us assume an anarchist dictatorship: I, who would be opposed to it, would spread propaganda against it. Undoubtedly I and my adherents would be declared enemies of the State, arrested, and thrown in jail. We would surely be called reactionaries.

Here I assert that during a revolution Anarchists would take their places in the organs of revolutionary cohesion, guidance, orientation, and reconstructive direction, but never in the government. That is an institution of armed, obedient and passive forces who impose their own judgement upon others.

From statements made to me upon this subject, I have come to the conclusion that the principal misunderstanding among Anarchists has arisen from our divergent conceptions of the function of Anarchy in the revolution. The desire to conquer, as the separate movement of one clique, seems to me to prevail above the wish to see our ideas triumph. Still, the truth is, that a real victory on our part, in a totalitarian sense of the word, is not to be considered as to-morrow's success; while our ideas can win to-day and gain ground in little things, the revolution will enhance the opportunity for broadening and completely establishing our principles.

But let us speak clearly: If a revolution today would do away with the present State, we can be sure that a government of some kind would be reorganized—it would inevitably emanate from the authoritarian mentality and psychology of the masses. And if the latter would wish to have a government, we could not deny them the right to have it. This government would always be, more or less, an enemy, and our fight against authority would have to go on and on.

Yet some comrades remark: "But if we have sufficient forces in the revolution (a daring minority imposing itself and being sustained by popular sympathy, though not anarchists,) could we not accept the reign of government, make use of its power and direct events towards the realization of our ideas?" It would be impossible, for the simple reason that once we have obtained power we would not be able to do what we now imagine has to be done. Then, our position, through the practical immediate necessities would compel us to act contrary to our very principles and become the same oppressors as the other governments. On the other hand, if we should have sufficient forces, they would be a thousand times more efficacious by remaining in the opposition.

Indeed, a government that is the outcome of a revolution will be less tyrannical—it will tolerate more freedom and be able to do some good things in spite of the evil which is inherent in its function—but not with the cooperation or participation of Anarchists—to the contrary, only with the latter's intelligent opposition through direct action and pressure will the government be led in the direction of humanitarianism.

And the function of Anarchism is precisely to constitute, so long as governments exist, this very force of opposition; an opposition which must not only consist (as many Anarchists believe,) in negation and destruction, but also in the affirmation and reconstruction of the proper forms of an autonomous life in complete freedom.

Luigi Fabbri

(Translated from "Studi Sociali" of Montevideo, by J. Scarceriaux.)

The concrete facts of war are always murder, mangle and destruction on the physical plane, together with organized lying and the stirring up of hatred on the psychological plane.

—Aldous HUXLEY.

Authority and Reaction--Twin Brothers

Samuel Polinow

A revolting spectacle took place on Monday night, February 21. A howling mob, members of a Nazi bund, held a mass-meeting to extol Nazidom's campaign of terror against humanity. Swastika banners flaunted over the heads of thousands cheering, yelling and "heiling" Nazis. The meeting hall was decorated with anti-Semitic placards bearing inscriptions that insulted and humiliated the Jewish population. Uniformed "storm troopers" patrolled in goose-stepping fashion to keep the meeting in nazified order. The speakers shouted from the platform, devoting all their violent attacks on Jews and all other people not in sympathy with Nazi principles. Heils and Nazi salutes greeted every vile outburst from the speakers' platform. Finally, amid wild cheering from the inside and tumultuous rioting from the outside, the Horse-Wessel anthem was sung and the meeting came to a close.

Where do you suppose the abominable spectacle occurred, in Munich? in Berlin? in Dusseldorf?

You are wrong. It happened in Madison Square Garden, which is in the heart of New York, the largest city in the U. S. A.

Who do you suppose sanctioned the meeting that purported to spread hatred and condemnation for all not within the realm of Nazi creed, Herr Hitler? Herr Goebbels? Herr Goering?

Again you are wrong. The affairs of New York, as far as we know, are governed by the "liberal" gentlemen Mr. Lehman and Mr. LaGuardia (for whom, by the way, the socialists and communists shouted themselves hoarse they should be carried into office).

Now we come to the main issue involved, namely, the Right to free speech and free assembly—as guaranteed by the Constitution. It is this Right the governing authorities claimed as a pretext to allow the Nazi Bund to hold its boisterous meeting at the Madison Square Garden.

No fair-minded person, of course, will deny this "right" to any individual or group, however vicious or repulsive their doctrinal teaching may be. We of the libertarian movement have fought and bled, and are to this day voicing our strongest protest against authoritative infringement on this Right. Civil liberty and civil right is essential to the progress of civilization and should be defended by society at all costs. There is no dispute about that. But the saintly cloak donned by the authorities of New York as guardians of these rights is nothing but sham and perfidy. Well do we remember how free speech and free assembly has been flagrantly denied to those who advocated socialistic ideas. These Constitutional rights, so sacred now in preserving freedom of speech for the German-American Bund, have constantly been violated and suppressed whenever and wherever liberal ideas have threatened to repudiate the reactionary form of authoritative rule.

Some of you readers may well remember the subversive methods employed by the police in disrupting radical meetings. Do you recall? Think back a little and you will come upon some such scene: An organization professing certain radical views would call a mass-meeting, or arrange a lecture, where a prominent speaker is to explain the political significance of its ideas. A permit would be granted to the sponsors of the meeting—that is the Constitutional right.... But then, just as the meeting is called to order and after the first few sentences are spoken by the orator, the commanding officer of several police squads that lined up the hall would jump on the platform and gruffly announce: In the Name of the Law I Declare this meeting closed. That was the signal for the police to begin wielding their clubs and rush the audience from the hall. Usually it would end with several of the audience's heads being split, and with the arrest of the speaker on a charge of "disorderly conduct."

You remember the Palmer days, don't you? "Reds" were then haunted down like wild beasts: they were either thrown in jail or deported. Meetings were then prohibited, free speech was curbed without even the pretense of referring to Constitutional rights. Emma Goldman can tell you how she had been met at every railroad station and escorted back from the town or taken to jail—until she was finally given free transportation on the Bufford.

The wild persecutions of radicals by stately authority has somewhat relaxed in the past few years, but that isn't due to any liberal attitude taken by authority with respect to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. No, not by any stress of imagination. The simple truth is that the radical leadership of today—the socialists and communists—has repudiated its Marxian ideology and jumped the bandwagon of one of the major political parties affiliated with the capitalist class—which is the reason for the government's change of policy towards the radical movement. As a matter of fact, the fundamental principles of our own ideas, and those who have the courage to openly advocate them, are still subjected to all sorts of persecution, notwithstanding the "rights and privileges" accorded all men by the Constitution. Wherever freedom of thought is expressed it is bound to feel the iron hand of the law, constitution or no constitution.

Not so it is with the malicious doctrines advocated by such dark elements as the German-American

Bund. This has been proven in New York when the Bund held its much publicized mass-meeting. Ostensibly, the Mayor—or his acting Mayor, as it happened to be the case in Mr. LaGuardia's absence—ordered a force of 1700 policemen to guard the Nazi meeting as a precaution against possible rioting or violence by anti-Nazi crowds. But to those who have observed more closely what stringent measures were taken to

This Funny World...

According to a New York Times report dated March 7, the New China Daily News, official paper of the Chinese Communist Party, has "editorially condemned the use of terrorism against the Japanese and their Chinese 'puppets' by loyal Chinese of Shanghai."

Really, the Chinese should know better. The only ones it is quite proper to assassinate, they might learn from Stalin, are Old Bolsheviks, Trotskyites, Bukharinites and revolutionaries generally!

—WORKERS AGE

The J. P. Morgan and Co. and Kuhn, Loeb and Co., control 90% of the major railroad roads, according to figures revealed by the Labor Research Association.

The low ebb in human depravity reached its high watermark when Premier Bela Imredi of Hungary resigned his post when finding out that he was of Jewish blood, but held no regrets for all the anti-Semitic laws that he had promulgated.

Mrs. Ida Wetmore, of swanky Piedmont, Calif., left \$30,000 to provide for three stray cats, since her own had died...

The pay-triatic tools of the exploiters of the land, congressmen, are attempting to railroad through a law that would subject to deportation any alien advocating "any changes in a form of government". Shades of Emerson, Thoreau and Jefferson!...

A United Press cable from Paris, of March 24, reads in part: "Prospects of an era of labor peace in France increased today though the Government of Premier Daladier practically abolished the forty-hour week. The Premier, acting under newly granted powers established a sixty-hour week in the armaments and allied industries in a move that nullified the hard-won Popular Front victory of 1936."

From our Mexican correspondent comes this interesting anecdote of Batista's visit to Mexico:

"In the recent parade to welcome Batista to Mexico, staged by the CTM, the leading sign in one section of the parade was WELCOME TO BATISTA"—Slaughter House Workers' Union!

—SOCIALIST CALL

The Senate Civil Liberties Committee made public on March 20 a report showing that leading employers of the country purchased \$1,255,312 of tear and sickening gas between June 1937, "chiefly during or in anticipation of strikes." Furthermore, "their totals far surpass those of large law-enforcement purchasers."

The suggestion that Major General George Van Horn Moseley, retired, be tried for sedition because of a speech made in Boston recently is characterized as "preposterous" by the American Civil Liberties Union in a letter to Secretary of War Harry H. Woodring.

Writing to Phil Frankfeld, secretary of the Communist Party of Massachusetts, Roger Baldwin, A. C. L. U. director, declared:

"We are amazed to see the Communist Party call for sedition trial against anybody. Members of the party themselves have been the victims of these un-American statutes, and have consistently protested not only against the prosecutions but against the statutes themselves. To invoke such a law against an opponent is to invite its use against yourselves. We had assumed that the experience of Communists with gag legislation had taught the fundamental lesson of civil liberty that unless rights are assured for all, friends and opponents alike, they are not assured for any."

—American Civil Liberties Union News.

The Communist press published a manifesto which read in part:

"After being informed about the fall of Barcelona the Communist parties of France, Great Britain, United States, Canada, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, Latin America and Spain have sent out the following flaming appeal to all people of the world who love peace and liberty....

"Boycott the goods of Hitler's Germany, Italy and Japan, and all goods supplies to Germany, Italy and Japan. Not a ton of coal, not a cask of motor-oil to the invasion armies or the traitor Franco."

At the very same time the fascist "Giornale d'Italia" wrote:

"Through the new treaty the commercial exchange between the two countries (Italy and Russia) will increase from 400 to 1000 millions of liras. The treaty is the greatest ever closed by Italy with the Soviet Union. The imported Russian goods will be paid in 'barred liras' which the Soviet Union will use to pay their purchases on the Italian market. Among the goods which Italy will import from the Soviet Union are: oil, mangan, coal, wheat, barley and wood."

Bert HILLSIDE

safeguard the Nazis and how flagrantly the rights of their opponents were disregarded, it becomes obvious that the enormous force of police protection given the Bund rally had an explicit purpose, namely, to give aid and comfort to an ideology which is infested with reaction. It becomes more evident when we consider how the Bund has deliberately broken every legal phase of its agreement without interference from the law and the one-sided role played by the police on several occasions when Nazis and anti-Nazis came to grips. Let us enumerate them:

First. The management of the Madison Square Garden explicitly stated that in its agreement with the Bund it was expressly stipulated that no anti-Semitic placards or anti-Semitic speeches will be permitted. Now then, anti-Semitic banners decorated the hall long before the doors had been opened to the Nazi conclave; anti-Semitic fire-spitting was thrown by every Nazi orator on the platform. Did this not constitute a breach of contract? Did not the management—if it wished to be fair—have a legal status to refuse opening the hall without infringing on the right of free speech?

Second. In a speech delivered by the acting mayor, Mr. Newbold Morris, a day prior to the disgraceful meeting, he publicly declared that he will not tolerate the wearing of Nazi uniforms by Bund members (he cited a certain law which gives him such privilege). In spite of this declaration, storm troopers paraded the hall in full Nazi regalia without molestation, nor were they even reprimanded by the Acting Mayor's police.

Third. A strange incident occurred at the Bund rally in Madison Square Garden. While the American Hitler, Fritz Kuhn, was frothing at the mouth, throwing all the slanderous invectives on the Jewish race, a young man, Greenbaum by name, could no more control his temper listening to the abusive attacks on "his people" and jumped on the platform—apparently with intention of landing a blow at the face of the orator. Immediately Hitler's storm troopers pounced upon him, enjoying all the time in the world to shower him with blows until he was battered up almost beyond recognition. Mind you, the hall was packed with blue-coated officers of the law, yet, at this crucial moment they must have all become so weak-kneed that they couldn't move fast enough to rescue the daring protester from the pounding fists of those "wooden maniacs."

Fourth. Another one of those incidents occurred when Dorothy Thompson was ejected from the hall by Hitler's storm troopers because she laughed out loud at a silly anti-Semitic attack on Pres. Roosevelt by William Kuhnze, one of the principal speakers at the rally. Under Constitutional guarantee she had a perfect right to laugh—just as we sometimes burst out laughing at a funny stunt performed by a clown—yet, only the fact that she had been assigned to the meeting as a reporter persuaded the police to permit her return to the press table.

Fifth. It was only natural that a meeting of Nazis, whose chief aim is to spread a campaign of terror against a humanity not of Aryan breed, that such perverted campaign should evoke a bitter protest of anti-Nazis, who staged a demonstration outside the meeting hall. It was a peaceful demonstration. Those who took part in it simply picketed the hall, appealing to the public not to be swayed by the malicious propaganda which is being promoted within the hall; no more and no less. There was no sign of any provocative methods on the side of the picketers. In spite of that, the peaceful marchers were handled by the "guardians" of law and order as though they were mad dogs. Mounted police rushed upon them with their night-sticks, breaking up every attempt by the demonstrators to come near the meeting place. Result: Scores have been waylaid and sent to hospitals for treatment.

What does it mean? Why did the authorities, under the guise of "freedom of speech," find it necessary to pamper and cuddle a Nazi conclave that was staged a la made-in-Germany pattern while the rights of peaceful demonstrators were trampled under foot?

These are pertinent questions, for they clearly show that government and reaction go hand in hand. They prove definitely and conclusively that the dark forces of reaction will always find a faithful ally in government, however liberal its political background. It isn't only that we have pointed out a single local incident such as the Bund rally affair, where government has taken sides with reaction. We see it manifest itself in every social and political occurrence that history has prescribed for the human race. Whether it applies to the Spanish struggle for freedom, the IWW movement in America or the syndicalist movement in France—government authority will inevitably unite with those elements that seek their annihilation.

To us, believers in absolute freedom, the issue is clear cut. We should repudiate all the political machinations invented by the socialist and communist traitors who have thrown in their lot with "this" or "that" political administration. Our doctrine shall remain unaltered. We shall rest firm in our belief that Man will free himself from the barbaric forces of reaction only when he shall embrace the social significance of an absolute free society.

WHAT IS IN A NAME?

Last summer "fifty-odd men and women" held a Conference at Mohegan Colony, (N. Y.), at the conclusion of which they issued a Manifesto embodying their own social beliefs. They called it a "Manifesto of Libertarian Socialist League" and signed it through the name of Harry Kelly as "Temporary Secretary" of the "Libertarian Socialist League."

Of course, any number of men and women have a perfect right to assemble wherever they please to discuss whatever they want, to come to the conclusions which best suit their convictions, to found all the leagues they want, to call them as they like and issue any manifesto that suits them. This right is not even subject to discussion.

However, it happens that Harry Kelly, the signer of the Libertarian Socialist Manifesto, has been known throughout the world—for longer than I can remember—as an Anarchist.

Furthermore, the Manifesto itself—as published in MAN! (Dec. 1938)—is followed by a note stating that the conclusions therein incorporated "represent fairly accurately the libertarians of America even though they were not actually delegated by the groups they came from."

Last, but not least, the Libertarian Socialist League adopts for itself the definition traditionally known as the definition of Anarchism. "We call ourselves libertarians and socialists in the broadest sense of these terms"—says the Manifesto—"and define our theories as follows: Libertarian-Socialism: The philosophy of a new social order based on liberty unrestricted by man-made law; the theory that all forms of government rest on violence, and are therefore wrong and harmful, as well as unnecessary. Libertarian-Socialist: A believer in Libertarian-Socialism."

All this gives the strange impression that Anarchism has ceased to exist in the United States and that the Anarchists have become "Libertarian-Socialists," all "fairly accurately" represented—as such—by the Libertarian-Socialist League of Mohegan Colony.

Nothing is further from the truth. The conferees of Mohegan Colony represented only themselves. Already several comrades have raised their voices against such an assumption. MAN! has done likewise. The actions of the Socialist-Libertarian League are an attempt to unfairly and inaccurately represent all libertarians or, more exactly, all the Anarchists of America. To protest against this is not an intrusion into a private matter.

To the protests already voiced I wish to add mine, not because I think it to be of any special value, but because there are many reasons why Anarchism should continue to exist in name as well as in fact and why Anarchists should not change their name, least of all change it to that of Socialists. Some of these reasons I ask permission to state.

Since these self-styled Libertarian-Socialists define their convictions with the same words and notions they used when they called themselves Anarchists, it must be assumed that they have not changed their philosophy of life and society, but that only the name of Anarchism has become obnoxious to them.

If this is the case, then it is only fair to ask: Why? Why is it that Harry Kelly, for instance, a man who has carried the name of anarchist for a whole lifetime, should become tired of this name and suddenly—without changing his political and social views—change this name to that of Libertarian-Socialist?

The Manifesto is silent on this point. No explanation is given. We might try to surmise why. But, I, for one, will not. We know why we do not intend to accept for ourselves and our ideals this nominal change from Anarchists and Anarchism to Libertarian-Socialists and Libertarian-Socialism, and this is sufficient to dispense us from inquiring into the motives of people who wish to keep them secret.

I like the name of Anarchism, and I like to be called an Anarchist. I dislike Socialism—even when modified by the adjective Libertarian, and I do not want to be called a Socialist—no matter how qualified—for a number of reasons which I am going to try to explain.

Anarchism, defined as a social order where no political or economical authority is admitted, defines and expresses my convictions clearly and perfectly. Socialism does not because its conception of social economy is totalitarian and because its historical meaning is associated with all forms of state and authority from the dictatorial socialism of the Russian Bolsheviks to the national socialism of the fascists. The addition of the qualification to the term Socialism of Libertarian conveys the idea of a more or less platonic notion of the desirability of liberty in the Socialist regime, as opposed to the totalitarian conception of Dictatorial Socialism. Socialism is what is wanted foremost; Libertarianism is at most a qualification of what is wanted. Now, Anarchists want liberty first and above all—liberty in the economical as well as in the political and moral sphere—as a mode of life, as a form of social intercourse, as a status in itself, not as a tendency grafted upon a totalitarian conception of economics, such as Socialism undoubtedly is. Anarchism, as I understand it, seeks, above all, the emancipation of the human being from

all kinds of authority—whether of the individual or of the group. Therefore, the first item in its program is the vindication of freedom for the human being to live, work and love as he finds most suitable. Anarchism does not exclude association of effort. No conception of society does. But it certainly excludes any preconceived socialization of all things and all efforts.

The name Anarchism is generally hated by and repulsive to a great majority of our contemporaries; and Anarchists are more or less persecuted by all governments. True. But what the mob hates and the governments persecute are not the names. They hate and abhor what these names signify; they persecute the men and the women who believe in what anarchism stands for. Call it by any other name, the mob will continue to hate it, and governments will continue to persecute those who preach it and even more those who try to practice it. They hate and persecute our uncompromising aversion for the State; our moral revolt against its class rule, its violence, its brutality and corruption; they hate our love for liberty and justice; they persecute our effort to make possible a social order in which all privileges will have been levelled, where all human beings will have an equal right to well-being, to the material and spiritual riches of humankind. Call this by any different name, their hate and persecution will not subside. I firmly believe that our renunciation—because of such hate and persecution—of a name which fits our social beliefs perfectly would be a cowardly renunciation of our identity. It would be a subterfuge unworthy of our moral dignity and as useless in practice as it is insincere. Our forefathers fought and died to conquer for themselves and for posterity the right to freedom of thought. We are duty bound to preserve their heritage. Since Anarchism is our social and political creed, we must vindicate and defend our right to be and to call ourselves Anarchists. By renouncing our name we renounce our identity, we renounce our right to hold such identity. Some may call it sagacity or political strategy. Its real name is cowardice—the most insane and useless cowardice that could be devised; because it implies acknowledgment of the enemy's power to force Anarchists to change their name. More than that, it implies acknowledgment of the enemy's right to establish what people shall believe, of its right to hate and persecute us no matter what name we may adopt. Enhanced by our submission to their preposterous pretensions which, incidentally, are unconstitutional in this country, they will feel authorized to force us to change names again and again until we shall resign further and shall change our ideals as well. If we want to defend our moral and political right to believe what we think is right, just and reasonable, we are bound to stand up sometime and fight for our right. The sooner we take such a stand, the sooner will this right be respected and recognized. The first step is to refuse to give up our name as Anarchists.

The terms Socialism and Socialists are hated less and respected more by peoples and governments. True. But the explanation of this different treatment is all but honorable. Socialism and Socialists are more tolerated because they are less feared, because these names—through the behaviour of those who bear them—have become mockeries of revolt, of liberty, of justice, of Socialism itself. Anarchists are hated and persecuted as sincere apostles of human emancipation. Socialists are respected, instead, courted and even exalted because they are considered nowadays as practical politicians, i. e. capitalistic politicians. They are respected, courted and exalted by the privileged classes who have no fear of Socialist interference in the enjoyment of their riches, by the holders of power in government because they see in the socialists their faithful allies in the preservation of the existing order. I would rather be hated and persecuted than respected, courted and exalted under such conditions and by such classes of people. I

In the Italian Prisons

In Italy's dungeons there are 45,762 political prisoners, without counting the several thousands who have been deported to the penal islands.

They are subjected to a regime that can only be described as a living death.

Though it is difficult to obtain news from such prisons, now and then a few facts leak out, news of brave anti-Fascists being done to death by the Fascist Police.

In the prison of Trento a worker named Rovereto was tortured to death.

In the prison of Bologna the anti-Fascist Vergani was assassinated for resisting menaces and attempt to corruption.

In the prison of Forlì on March 25th, 1938 (the news has just leaked out), Pietro Raine of San Leonardo, near Ravenna, was hung by the prison guards after having been savagely tortured.

In the prison of Castelfranco, where there are several hundred political prisoners, Antonio Rietolini, condemned for the second time to 16 years of penal servitude, also died recently as result of tortures.

A doctor friend of ours is now in Italy, where, defying Fascist strict vigilance, he is making inquiries.

We hope shortly to be able to publish the information he was able to gather.

—NEW TIMES AND ETHIOPIAN NEWS.

cannot imagine a reasonable person willing to change his or her name from Anarchist to Socialist—unless he or she has forsaken the Anarchist ideal, of course—after all the betrayals the Socialists have consummated since 1914. I cannot imagine a sane person willing to be considered a comrade of Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin since these "gentlemen" and their cliques have betrayed the Russian Revolution. I cannot imagine a sane person willing to be considered a comrade of Noske, Scheidemann, MacDonald, Blum, Indalecio Prieto and Caballero since these "gentlemen" and their coteries have shown the world how the workers of their respective countries could be betrayed, in the name of Socialism, to the various capitalistic dictatorships which infest the Old World. Why, even their own followers are ashamed to be considered as the comrades and accomplices of such scum—so much ashamed that they are now inventing no end of factions and sub-factions in order to be distinguished as men and women of different schools or parties.

I do not know if the Libertarian-Socialists of the Mohegan Colony League are reasonable or sane, but they certainly chose the weirdest moment for their conversion to nominal Socialism. At this moment there is only one social-revolutionary movement which can present a clean, honest, unselfish record to the disinherited and oppressed of the world. It is the Anarchist movement. It has suffered much from the bloody hands of politicians and adventurers of all colors and classifications, and not the least from Socialist politicians and adventurers. But the anarchist movement stands alone. Its hands are clean. No workers' blood is on its conscience. There is no betrayal with which it can be reproached. Today all parties, particularly the Socialist parties of all shades, stand indicted by their own actions as accomplices of reaction, as enemies of human emancipation. They have been caught red-handed providing the capitalist class with means and arms, both political and material, in order to abet it in its attempt to restore political absolutism and economic feudalism. Only the Anarchist movement has consistently fought against—although unsuccessfully, so far—the present day reversion to barbarism. Only the Anarchist movement can unflinchingly still speak a word of hope to the oppressed, carry the flag and spread the idea of social emancipation to which it alone has remained faithful. To choose this moment to repudiate the name of Anarchism denotes at least a lack in the sense of opportunity. To choose this moment to adopt the name of Socialism denotes at least, a lack of tact, if not of self-respect.

Moreover, the name of Anarchism is dear to us also for its historical significance. It has been ferociously hated by all those whom we rightly consider as the pestilence of humanity: its gilded barbarians, its savage assassins, its unsatiable exploiters, its ignorant and bigoted sectarians. This is quite an honor. But Anarchism has also been loved, very deeply loved by men and women of several generations, by men and women whom we admire as the most complete specimen of what is noble and most civilized in humankind. To Anarchism these men and women have given their love, their mind and their hearts, sometimes their blood and their lives. They have enriched Anarchism by their work, by their example, often enough by their heroism or their martyrdom. For almost a century Anarchism has stood out, by virtue of the thoughts, deeds and efforts of hundreds and thousands of exceptionally proud men and women, as the foremost vanguard of human progress. We do not aim to make a religion of this century old history, but we respect it, we love it, we endeavour to emulate it. It belongs to us as Anarchists, it gives lustre to our efforts. We know that no one else will ever be willing to defend it. It is our task—by the example of good deeds, noble thoughts and unselfishness—to teach the world to acknowledge it and to respect it as the pioneer work of a new civilization advancing toward freedom for all.

I do not want to be sentimental, but I feel as if there was something reprehensible in this shirking of our duty towards those who preceded us in the social fight for liberty—a duty which, after all, confers upon us a much higher honor than that which most of us can ever hope to bring to it in a lifetime of devotion. Anarchism, to me, is a new world at its inception. To progress and to materialize the effort of those who have preceded us must be preserved and continued by us. To refuse to do so means to repudiate an obligation we assumed the day we first called ourselves Anarchists.

These are some of the things I find in the name of Anarchism—things which make me proud of calling myself an Anarchist and loathe to repudiate it.

Now it remains to be seen whether the Libertarian-Socialists of the Mohegan Colony League have really changed only in name; or whether, although preserving the traditional Anarchist definition of their aims they have changed also their practical interpretation of that definition and have become Socialists in fact as well as in name. This requires a lengthy analysis of the manifesto which, of course, is not possible at this time.

HAIL THE BILL OF RIGHTS!

[A Dramatic Sketch]

Marcus Graham

FOREWORD

The following sketch is entirely from memory. The author did not take any notes during the celebration herein dramatized, for he did not imagine that the occasion was to become a performance worthy of being recorded and published. The following sketch is not complete in that the speeches made and the words spoken by the characters taking part in the celebration do not appear in their entirety. It is obvious that this could not be done under the circumstances. The author is merely giving a summary, a resume of an occasion which, although unintentional on the part of each participant, turned out to be a veritable enlightening performance.

CHARACTERS

The Chairman A. L. Wirin (Defense Attorney for Marcus Graham)
 First Speaker Federal Judge Leon R. Yankwich
 Second Speaker Superior Judge John Beardsley (Defense Attorney for Marcus Graham in 1930)
 Chosen Guest Speakers Judge Henshaw, Leo Gallagher
 A Spectator
 The Uninvited Guest Marcus Graham

Scene of Action

The action in this sketch took place in Clifton's Cafeteria, 648 S. Broadway, Los Angeles, California, on March 7, 1939, between the hours of seven and ten in the evening. The occasion was a public mass meeting arranged by the Southern California Branch of the American Civil Liberties Union to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the presentation of the Bill of Rights. There was an audience of approximately 250 people. Clinton J. Taft, Director of the American Civil Liberties Union in Los Angeles, opened the meeting and introduced the CHAIRMAN.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and Gentlemen: We have many reasons for gathering here this evening to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the presentation of the Bill of Rights. First, we enjoy more liberties today than ever before in this country. Second, the Bill of Rights is being respected and upheld by many agencies and principally by the President of the United States. Third, here in the city of Los Angeles we are enjoying more civil liberties today than we ever did. Gone are the days of Captain Hynes and his brutal strong-arm method; gone are the days of searching without warrants. So—all in all—we have reasons enough for tonight's celebration. As to the first speaker of the evening, he needs no introduction. He has been a constant champion of civil liberties. And if you want to see how this Judge acts, just pay a visit to the beautiful, new and spacious quarters in which he holds court and administers justice. It is true that there have been times when I have strongly differed with some of his decisions. This fact notwithstanding, I deem it a great privilege to introduce the first speaker of the evening, Federal Judge Leon R. Yankwich, whose topic is: "The Political Philosophy Behind the Bill of Rights". Judge Yankwich.

FIRST SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, Dr. Taft Ladies and Gentlemen: I wish to thank Dr. Taft for the honor he has bestowed upon me when he invited me to address this gathering. A few years ago I delivered an address on the "Lawless Enforcement of the Law". This address was subsequently published, has had a widespread circulation and is often quoted. Some of my decisions have been quoted by other courts as examples of sound interpretation of the law. And since I want to feel fully responsible for what I have to say here this evening, I shall read to you from a written manuscript. When we examine the thesis upon which all the totalitarian states attempt to justify their reigns, we find that their premises—be they of fascist or bolshevik origin—all have one thing in common. They all aim at the complete annihilation of the individual. The omnipotent State is something which the individual dares not broach. Mussolini admitted that much in his exposition of Fascism in the Fascist Encyclopedia. Lenin did the same long before him in "The State and Revolution". But when we examine the philosophy behind the Bill of Rights, we soon learn the difference between the totalitarian states, where the aim is to destroy the individual, and our own democracy, where the sovereignty of the individual is supreme. Yes, it is in the Bill of Rights that we will find the protection for the sovereignty of the individual which will be as much a blessing in the future as it has been in the past. We, those of us who wish to preserve our great democracy, must dedicate ourselves to the perpetuation and the safeguarding of the Bill of Rights.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sure everyone appreciates the splendid re-statement of the Philosophy Behind the Bill of Rights as presented by Judge Yankwich. I am certain that you all know the next speaker. He needs no introduction. With him I have seldom differed on questions involving civil liberties. So, without any further ado, I take great pleasure in introducing Superior Judge John Beardsley who will address us on "The Significance of the Bill of Rights Today". Judge Beardsley.

SECOND SPEAKER: Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Many waters have passed from the days when I was counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union until today. The greatest blessing of our democracy lies in the principle of Freedom of Ex-

pression. By this test our democracy either stands or falls to pieces. And with great anxiety and fear I look at those within liberal and radical circles who would deny the Nazis that right of Freedom of Expression for which we have fought at all times. And tonight I plead with all my liberal friends to realize that this is an erroneous position to assume. In realizing this, we shall be paying the highest tribute possible to the preservation of the Bill of Rights.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now that our speakers have expressed their opinions and thoughts, I shall open the floor for questions and discussion. Before doing so, however, I shall call upon a few honored guests who are with us this evening. The first of these is Judge Henshaw.

FIRST GUEST SPEAKER: I shall be very brief. What has made me realize the urgent need for an organization to protect the Bill of Rights was a case that recently came up before me. It involved the lawless acts of some of the members of the police force who, having a search warrant for the purpose of finding two articles specified in the warrant, raided everything except the wallpaper of the premises. But both the woman in the case and all her friends refused to sign any complaint. Finally, I swore out the complaint myself.

THE CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon an attorney whom all of us know and love—Leo Gallagher.

SECOND GUEST SPEAKER: I differ very much with what has been said here this evening about the Bill of Rights. How can we talk about its existence when we think of the millions of maltreated negroes in the South and even here in our vicinity? And what of the millions of workers who still have no right to organize? We are talking about civil liberties that are supposed to exist here and throughout the country while you and I know

A Lasting Persecution

April 15, 1939, marks the end of a twenty year period of persecution undergone by Marcus Graham, editor of MAN!. On that day twenty years ago, he was arrested for the first time at Paterson N. J. The result of that arrest was the order for his deportation to Canada on the charge of having in his possession literature that expounded the philosophy of anarchism. Since then, he has been jailed not less than five times. The Wilson, Harding, Hoover and Roosevelt administrations have all attempted to exile him from the United States. No one has ever been able to charge Graham with having committed any overt crime. He has solely been charged with holding political views not in agreement with and not meeting the approval of the authorities and rulers of this country.

As the readers undoubtedly know, the newest attempt of the Labor Department and its agencies to deport Marcus Graham is still pending in court. Attorney A. L. Wirin, who is defending Graham in behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union, has been notified by Judge Leon R. Yankwich that Graham is to appear before him on May 8, 1939, for a further hearing on the case. This action is in accordance with an order issued by the Ninth Federal Circuit Court.

At this time the Marcus Graham Freedom of the Press Committee wishes to re-emphasize its appeal to all true friends of freedom of thought and expression. It urges each and everyone to forward telegrams to Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins and demand that she immediately stop the persecution of Marcus Graham by cancelling the deportation proceedings against him. We request those who send telegrams and messages to forward copies to the press and to us.

We have already circulated and sent out more than 6000 copies of the pamphlet "Freedom of Thought Arraigned" which deals with the Graham case and the persecution made against the journal MAN!. We shall gladly send additional copies to those requesting them either for themselves or for the purpose of distributing them among their contacts. There is no price affixed to the pamphlet. However, it is not necessary to say that funds are needed to carry on this work which we deem to be of importance, especially since we are aware of the pressure exerted against all lovers of freedom by the forces of reaction throughout the world. For this reason, we are asking any and all persons who realize the importance of our work and who, like us, feel that it is high time to bring cases like those of Marcus Graham to the open, to send us their material aid. This appeal is also meant for groups and organizations who are interested in seeing that the principle of freedom of thought and of its expression is upheld in principle and maintained in practice. Try as we may, our work cannot be a success unless it is accompanied by the moral and material aid of all lovers of freedom, justice and equality.

All correspondence and funds should be addressed to:

MARCUS GRAHAM FREEDOM OF THE PRESS COMMITTEE,
 P. O. BOX 971, LOS ANGELES, CAL. U. S. A.

that every day in the year hundreds of illegal searches and arrests are being made. Innocent people are cast into jails and held there for days and weeks. Significantly enough, nothing has been said here this evening in connection with the economic background associated with the execution of legal justice and civil rights. How can we conceive of one without the other? Judge Yankwich has cited Russia as one of the totalitarian states wherein civil rights and justice do not exist. To this I answer that I know of no country where it is practiced more.

THE CHAIRMAN: No one has ever accused Leo Gallagher of lacking fearlessness, and he has again proved it this evening. I shall now open the floor for questions and discussion. (PAUSE)

I see that Marcus Graham has asked for the floor. Let me state that he is not an invited guest, and this station assumes no responsibility for whatever he has to say...

UNINVITED GUEST: So far this evening you have heard judges and lawyers tell you the blessings of the Bill of Rights, but you have not heard any of the victims who are being persecuted—the Bill of Rights notwithstanding. You will now have this opportunity. First of all, however, I must say something about the nature of this gathering. The whole arrangement appears to be of a dubious nature. As you know, this meeting is sponsored by the American Civil Liberties Union. You have heard Dr. Taft who, as the head of the local American Civil Liberties Union, was the first to come forward in my defense in 1930, when the U. S. government attempted to exile me to Mexico. You have also heard Judge John Beardsley, who was then the attorney for the Union and who defended me in behalf of the organization. And the chairman of this gathering is my present defense attorney in the U. S. government's newest attempt to deport me. Another of this evening's speakers was Judge Leon R. Yankwich, who sentenced me to jail because I refused to testify against myself. And here am I, the hounded and unwanted man, the persecuted and misrepresented anarchist. Dr. Taft, as head of the local Union and as editor of its organ—The Open Forum—has denounced in no uncertain terms the sentence pronounced upon me by Judge Yankwich. Dr. Taft has also denounced Judge Yankwich's sustaining of the 19-year-old persecution against me by the government as a most reactionary act and as a betrayal of the Judge's self-affirmed liberalism. Attorney Wirin has done likewise. As far as I know, neither Dr. Taft nor Mr. Wirin has retracted anything written by them in the Open Forum. Nor has Judge Yankwich made the slightest move to admit that he erred. Under these circumstances, I believe that the local American Civil Liberties Union will have to do quite a bit of explaining for having invited Judge Yankwich as a speaker at this gathering. The whole thing seems to resemble a sort of comical tragedy. It would take the pen of a Charles Erskine Scott Wood to write an Earthly Discourse that might do justice to the travesty here being enacted. Now, as far as my experiences with the enforcers of the Bill of Rights are concerned, I would like to relate what took place last October in the Ninth Federal Circuit Court of Appeals. Three Federal Judges were listening to arguments in the appeal filed against the six months prison sentence imposed upon me by Judge Yankwich when I refused to testify against myself and thereby aid in getting myself deported. I was almost shocked to learn that the three Judges had actually read the briefs of my attorneys, Wirin and Stanton. One of the three Judges asked of the U. S. District Attorney: "Did the Government have a new warrant of arrest when they jailed the defendant in October, 1937?" The U. S. District Attorney replied that he was not certain about that. Then the Judge further asked: "Was the defendant then jailed under the old order of 1919?" Again the U. S. District Attorney replied that he was not certain. Commented one of the Judges in open Court: "Since the Government grants that the old order of deportation is *functus officio* and in the absence of a new warrant, the arrest and jailing of the defendant, his being questioned by immigration officials and his being brought into court amount to a chain of lawless acts challenging thereby the legality of the entire proceedings." At this point, Mr. Ernest Besig, my friend and Director of the San Francisco Civil Liberties Union, said to me that the Judge was hitting the nail on the head, and that that was the crux of the whole situation. For a moment it appeared as though an anarchist was about to receive that which he never expects of any court: Justice. But the joy of my friend Besig was momentary. Finally, one of the Judges made the following statement which I repeat in no spirit of derision: "How is it that Judge Yankwich, a learned judge, should have ruled that all the questions asked the defendant were pertinent? He slipped on this point." After several weeks of deliberation, the three, wise Judges of the Ninth Federal Circuit Court of Appeals rendered their decision. They sustained Judge Yankwich in his upholding of all the lawless acts committed by the Department of Labor against me. However, they reversed the prison sentence which Judge Yankwich had imposed upon me. How did this happen? The three Judges hit upon a bright idea. They decided

CORRESPONDENCE and DISCUSSION

Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties.—JOHN MILTON.

A Letter From Australia

I have just read Herbert Read's "Poetry and Anarchism." It is very good as an antidote against the tyranny of capitalist, socialist and State-Communism. A world-wide revolt is slowly taking place in that regard, but still it is not enough. The tragedy of Spain is just another lesson for all of us crushed between the two Internationals: Red and Black. The workers have done very little except shout about democracy—a prostituted one at that.

Events in Australia are not humanly good, for nature has her harsh ways. Following a terrific heat wave, awful bush fires have occurred in the S. E. part of Australia; scores of humans have lost their lives; whole villages have been burnt, over a 100 homes went up in smoke. At the same time a terrific flood has swept the western part of Australia. The heat reached as high as 122.

In New South Wales, workers have refused to load iron for Japan, only to find the leaders coming to an agreement with the Government. The result was that the iron is to be loaded. Once again a genuine effort is beaten by want of solidarity caused by the fake Kremlin disciples.

The same misery and poverty exists in regard to those who have not that blessed work. A rather interesting position has developed in Australia as a result of the National Act similar to the one in Great Britain. The non political party section of Major Douglas, has so organized resistance that the all powerful Federal Government has postponed it for 9 months. Douglas has some very anarchistic ways—such as his warning that nothing can be done within the frame-work of the capitalistic system. Several years ago they had started a very strong organization, but the political hirelings split the movement. They are now recovering a little. It is always good work that causes a Government to step backwards. I have a very good deal of sympathy for Douglas, but he grossly underestimates the deep-rooted power of the State with its props of the army, church and politicians. Vested interests will always cling to privilege.

We are all glad that Tom Mooney has been released. It is no credit to the great labor movement of the world that a proved innocent man can be jailed for 22 years. But what of Billings and the legions dying in forgetfulness in Siberia? Our Kremlin friends will shower blessings on Tom Mooney.

I have no doubts about the growth of anarchism from now on. I regret that I am past the half century, as I feel the time is near at hand when the intellectuals of the world will come to the aid of the submissive mass. Bakunin's statement that the destiny of man is in the hands of the peasant is important. War will prove that pressure will cause the

food producer to become so proletarianized that he will demand the freedom to live and to follow the noblest work of mankind—the tiller of the soil.

I have read comrade Havel's pamphlet "What's Anarchism," and I was very pleased to read his protest against fake ideas. A man who is ashamed of Anarchism is afraid of truth itself. I have reason to believe that many of the Leaders in Spain have made a great mistake in collaborating with a foreign agency.

Dan LANIG

From Communism to Anarchism

I was formerly a member of the Communist party. I was connected with that party (for over nine years) until the early part of this year when I was still in Hawaii. I could not stand the dictatorial attitude taken by the leaders of that party. The arguments that ensued found me kicked out of the party which I have not regretted. I believe my ideas all along have been of the anarcho-communist ideal. I believe every individual should be given absolute liberty in fighting those forces that have been enslaving mankind. The Communist party instead of being a champion of liberty is one with the very forces that enslave mankind! Its dictatorial tactics have glaringly proved this.

Comradely yours,

K. N.

Communes in Palestine

Dear Comrade Marcus Graham:

First allow me to thank you for your newspaper MAN! which reaches us regularly. Our English reading comrades find it very interesting.

Although our living a communal-agricultural life is fundamentally objectionable to you—so one gathers from reading your paper—but in spite of that we think that there is a common object for us all to strive for; the economic emancipation of the individual by himself together with the united strength of the many like himself in the collective.

It is probable that your outlook as stated in your paper stands higher—as a fundamental new social form of life—than the life of the Free Communes in Palestine.

We join with you in a war which you are fighting with a "democratic government," on your right as a free man to live think and act as your conscience dictates. We wish you success in your fight for the truth, within the "laws of democracy of America of the Free."

In this letter you will find a leaflet that is given out by a group of comrades living in free communes. The aim of this undertaking is to collect the efforts and achieve-

ments of all communes throughout the world. This Contact Bureau with its centre in Palestine would be linked up with all communes in the world, centralize all information and have it printed, and so keep all who are interested informed of the problems bound up in this form of life.

If you have nothing against the contents of this leaflet, please print it in your paper. Our comrade Tabory who keeps in touch with you through correspondence is now in Europe, he is expected to return within the next two or three months.

I hereby sign myself in the name of our group of Libertarian comrades. With comradely greetings.

B. GILAD

The Leaflet

Afikim, Mr. Cop.

P. O. Kinereth, Palestine.
Dear Comrades,

In this brief letter, we, a group of comrades living in Palestine, turn to you. Our communal movement is in existence more than twenty-five years, and numbers over twenty thousand souls, living in communal agriculture and mixed agricultural-industrial colonies, scattered over all of Palestine. This movement bears various political ideas, but all are based upon complete communal ownership of property, and upon self labor (from each according to his ability and to each according to his need).

We were greatly pleased to hear of the existence of movements similar to ours in other countries, bearing the ideal of brotherhood and peace among men, and whose aim is to alter the face of the existing society by giving an individual and group example of life without exploitation, a life of self-labor.

In this trying hour for all seekers after true peace when the forces of fascism and dictatorship are chocking every spark of freedom and peace, it is incumbent upon us to unite all those forces striving for peace and a free life without exploitation, to make known their attempts at improving the existing society according to their beliefs. Let the motive for the creation of their communal society be what it may, religious, political, or social, for us the important fact is that we are striving towards a common goal.

Individual comrades from among the various communal groups of all political colourings in Palestine, took upon themselves the initiative of creating an international contact point for the world communal movement. Such a contact point would form a bond between all existing communes in the entire world, would concentrate the knowledge of their

(Continued on page 7, Col. 3.)

that Judge Yankwich is to limit himself to deciding which of the questions asked me are not incriminating under federal or state laws. Thus the case has been sent back to Judge Yankwich, and one of these days I shall again be hailed before him. Yes, it all sounds very beautiful when men come forward and make nice speeches such as those made this evening about the Bill of Rights. But it is quite another thing to practice what one preaches. The whole issue in my case is the lawlessness of the immigration officials. This has been clearly brought out in the records in the case. And all that was required was for Judge Yankwich to refuse to sustain the lawlessness of public officials whom he so eloquently denounces in his pamphlet of the same name. Or, if he erred in his decision, he should have been big enough to admit his mistake. Even judges can err.... The Chairman, who is my attorney in this case, has told you that if you want to see how Judge Yankwich renders justice, you should go down to the spacious and beautiful new quarters, in which he holds court. I have not seen the new quarters, but I do not doubt the correctness of Mr. Wirin's description of the building. Yet, I am forced to remember that whenever I land in jail, the quarters in which I am placed are anything but spacious or beautiful. In fact, they are most uncomfortable—to the point that I am always forced to sleep on the floor.... And I do not imagine that either Judge Yankwich or Mr. Wirin had that experience. (Audience laughs.)

FIRST SPEAKER: Go right ahead! You have been calling me all sorts of names in your paper. I do not mind what you say....

UNINVITED GUEST: We are confronted with the question of theory and practice. Judge Yankwich has delivered a masterful interpretation of the Political Philosophy Behind the Bill of Rights. It is true that he spoke so fast that most of us, I presume, were not able to follow him. But we derived the general idea. I know that Judge Yankwich takes pride in the pamphlet he has written—"The Lawless enforcement of the Law." It is too bad that he did not have its contents in mind when he upheld the lawless acts committed against me by the Labor Department since 1919. I am certain that Judge Yankwich will publish the talk he made here this evening. I hope that he does that and that he will see to it that each of you receive a copy. Now I want to show you another pamphlet, (holds up a pamphlet which he has taken from his pocket) The title of this pamphlet is "Freedom of Thought Arraigned." It deals with the oracles I have undergone during these nineteen years. It also contains the briefs prepared by A. L. Wirin and Lee B. Stanton, attorneys for the American Civil Liberties Union. It also contains the talk I gave

in court before Judge Yankwich sentenced me to prison. We shall be glad to send you one or more copies of this pamphlet without charge. I hope Judge Yankwich will do likewise when he publishes his talk. Then, when you have the time, read both pamphlets. Think over the thoughts expressed by the Judge and examine the facts as they are revealed in this pamphlet. You will then be in a position to reach your own conclusions, and you will be able to see how Judge Yankwich has failed to put into practice his eloquent ideas concerning the preservation of the Bill of Rights.

THE CHAIRMAN: As I have told you, this station is not responsible for what the uninvited speaker has said or might say. Now I have a request from one of the speakers who asks for the floor. I am sure no one will object to my granting him this request. Judge Yankwich.

FIRST SPEAKER: I have only had twenty minutes in which to read the talk I prepared for this evening. Last night I delivered the same talk before a Women's Club in Palm Springs, and I received one hundred dollars for it. But I spoke for one hour on the subject. At this time I am not going to read from any prepared manuscript. Graham has been calling me every kind of name in his paper and has repeatedly insulted me to my face. He has defied the Court and has declared that he will continue to defy every court in the land. In this case, I have acted according to the law. I know that he rejoices in the fact that the Circuit Court of Appeals has reversed my decision in his case. Let us see on what grounds the decision was reversed. The higher court has sustained me on every count except one. I ruled that an alien has no right to be an anarchist, whereas a citizen has. The highest court in the land ruled this to be the law in the Turner case in 1904. It still is the law of the land, and I merely based my decision on the law. I gave Graham 24 hours in which to reconsider his defiant attitude toward the Court. The next day he returned to Court with a bold speech on anarchy. This is a method used by all European anarchists before they are sentenced. Now, I have a better library than Graham has on books on anarchism, and my books are all from the original sources—in French. On the one point which the Circuit Court of Appeals decided against me, the decision rendered was not clear. I know that Graham was most anxious to become a martyr. But I refused to give him the opportunity. I could have sentenced him to jail indefinitely. Instead, I gave him the shortest possible sentence: two months.

UNINVITED GUEST: Six months.

FIRST SPEAKER: Yes, it was six months... and with this provision. Said sentence should termi-

nate the moment Graham would agree to answer the questions put to him either in court or by the immigration officials. But Graham was insistent in his defiant attitude. Thus, I was forced to sentence him for contempt of court. As Lewis Browne, a member of the Defense Committee acting in Graham's behalf said: "If a sovereign country cannot question the right of its subjects to be in its country, then such a country ceases to have any ground on which to stand."

THE CHAIRMAN: It would perhaps be best for me to maintain a neutral position in the issue raised by Mr. Graham and Judge Yankwich.

A SPECTATOR: Why is the American Civil Liberties Union defending an anarchist?

THE CHAIRMAN: I see now that it would be best for me to clarify the position of the Civil Liberties Union in the Graham case. First of all, we believe that an alien has as much right as a native to hold dissenting social views. Second, Graham was ordered deported 19 years ago. If the government could not succeed in deporting him within a reasonable length of time, then the constant re-arrests and attempts to exile him amount to actual political persecution. We contend that it is unfair and unjust to arrest a man four consecutive times under the same 19-year-old order of deportation. It is true that the highest court of the land ruled that aliens holding anarchist views are subject to deportation. But that ruling cited here this evening by Judge Yankwich, was made in 1904. That was 35 years ago. Since then we have seen many changes taking place in the minds of people and in the decisions made by the same high court. Graham has never been accused of having committed any singular crime except the one of having diverse and unpopular opinions. He belongs to a much misrepresented and, therefore, unpopular group. He edits a paper and would like to see it widely read. And the Civil Liberties Union holds that all circumstances considered it is unjust to persecute Graham. More than that, it is a violation of the very spirit of the Bill of Rights whose 150th anniversary we celebrate here this evening. I have differed with Judge Yankwich in his ruling on the case. And I still differ with him. Well, it is now getting late, and I think it is time to adjourn this meeting. I believe that all of us have spent a most enjoyable evening. The meeting is adjourned.

(As the audience leaves the hall, several people are distributing leaflets protesting the American Civil Liberties Union's invitation to Judge Yankwich as a principal speaker at the celebration. The leaflet, signed by Marcus Graham, was reprinted in full in the March issue of MAN!)

THE END

ART and LITERATURE

Work

Big Jim, as usual, was looking for work. Jim and his wife Jenny, and their five kids lived in a two room unpainted house away back in the forest close to the saw-mill narrow gauge railway that ran from Longview to Hawk's Nest. Now Hawk's Nest was a tiny saw mill village away back in East Texas near the Louisiana line. The giant pine towered high into the sky, like patriarchs of old pointing their hands upward.

Jim was six feet tall and thin as the bean pole he stuck in the sandy loam of his bean patch for malaria had raked him for all his forty-odd years. The mosquitoes came up from the dank swamps along the Texas-Louisiana line and the small mill town of Hawk's Nest was smothered. One time a doctor who had "been" to Tulane as the East Texans called going to College came along and started a fight against malaria but the lanky Texans said somebody was trying to interfere with their liberty and the doc went back to Shreveport thoroughly disgusted.

Finally Jim grew discouraged. There was nothing left for him in Hawk's Nest. He had to make a living for his wife and kids for winter was coming along. So, Jim grabbed a freight train one night down in Longview. The next morning he stepped out of an open box car in Dallas.

Jim's neck soon grew sore for he constantly stared at the skyscrapers that stood like nude giants reaching with concrete arms for stars.

"Want anybody to help 'round here?" Jim asked the warehouse foreman.

"Hell, no," the foreman snapped. "We aint hirin' anybody... we turning men off. Push on..."

That night Jim grew very hungry. He passed eating establishments and saw people busy filling themselves with fine steaks... drinking beer... laughing... having a good time. But Jim couldn't work for he didn't have a job and because he didn't have a job he couldn't eat. Jim looked around the corner, after walking several blocks toward the river. There he saw a long line of men. They too were eating. Jim sauntered up and just stepped in line because everybody seemed to be doing the same thing.

Soon Jim got a bowl of soup, a hunk of bread and a cup of coffee. He was in the bread line. But nobody told Jim. He knew he had found a place to eat. So he went back to Hawk's Nest and got his wife and kids and brought them to Dallas.

One cold, winter evening Jim stood in the bread line for food. He was smarter now for he knew that the city sometimes gave a hungry man a bowl of soup. He also begged the united charities for a few sacks of food for his kids.

Meanwhile Jim looked for work, but there was none. Finally he grew weary... gave up the search for a job. Another man and his family had been added to the relief rolls as business men whose stomachs stuck out from overeating talked about cutting salaries and reducing the payroll.

Breadline McClanahan

Steet like the sharp point of a stiletto struck Breadline McClanahan in the face as he stood before the welfare outpost waiting for a bowl of soup and cup of coffee.

"On the breadline again... still swingin' to the ol' line," sneered a bull who stood nearby eating a banana he had taken from an Italian's cart.

Breadline McClanahan shivered as the north wind struck him square in the face. He did not have sufficient spirit to talk back. But the maggots of hate were taking form in his madly mixed brain. Soon the welfare worker got to McClanahan and he was given a bowl of soup but the giver sneered as he handed out the free lunch: "Aint got a job yet... no of course not, and you aint getting one as long as the free meals last."

Breadline whimpered something about being beaten... sick.

"Why don't you say something about being an ex-con," the big cop said. "Why, don't you tell the truth... tell about goin' down the river for kickin' a crib... tell 'em 'bout tryin' to pass a hot check... that's why you can't get a job... nobody's going to give an ex-con a job..."

Breadline remained silent... a whipped man. "Why in the hell don't you say something," the cop growled. "Aint got no say comin'... Well you aint gonna get a job down in this district... not as long as I am on duty down here... think that over Breadline."

Breadline drank the weak coffee given him by the welfare worker. The maggots of hate still gnawed in his brain... Before his blurry eyes stood the policeman, his tormentor... the man who had kept him from getting work... the man who threatened to keep him permanently from work.

Breadline McClanahan really didn't know what he was doing when he reached for an iron bar on the ground. An instant later he crashed the policeman on the head.

A month later, Breadline McClanahan walked like a dumb beast to the electric chair. He was classed as a cold blood murderer.

As the guards led him along, McClanahan could



—Original Drawing by M. L.

Note For City Slaves

FIRST take a nice, thick bunch of grass in your hands Oh, say about fifteen or sixteen thousand blades. DID YOU THINK THIS IS A SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION?

NO, it's a story about what people ought to do. Tear the grass out of the earth. Bunch it between your palms—not too roughly. You might crush the sprouts and you'd certainly get your hands dirty. Don't be afraid that the grass has germs on it. It probably has—but they won't hurt you unless of course, someone with TB of the lung spat in the precise spot where you gathered your grass Oh, pick it up anyway. SMELL IT!

Don't you get that odor of growing things? You'd recognize it anywhere, wouldn't you? But I'll bet a cup of coffee that you can't identify it with anything familiar. It smells a little familiar to me. May be all growing things throw off something of the same odor. NOW BURY YOUR FACE IN THAT GRASS. It's the commonest vegetable life on the face of the earth. JUST HOW MUCH OF IT DO YOU SEE EVERY YEAR?

Naturally, passing on elevated trains you see stains of green in every backyard. BUT WHEN YOU'RE WALKING ON THE STREET YOU CAN'T SEE THROUGH BUILDINGS, CAN YOU? You've been promising yourself a potted geranium for your windowsill For literally years, my dear— BUT YOU'VE NEVER GOTTEN IT, YOU FOOL! You've seen bird seed sprout in bowls And sometimes you wish you had a little garden on your table like it

With a few Chinese figures and a tiny imitation lake. I made something like that years ago. YOU'RE STILL SMELLING THAT GRASS? WHIRLS YOU AROUND A BIT, doesn't it— The ripple of bubbling waters on colored pebbles Of mountain streams roaring down jagged gulleys. WITH NO ONE TO BOTHER YOU WHEN YOU WANT TO SEE ALL THAT. AND THE SUNSET! THE SUNSET! Those buildings in the way again Oh, tear them down you sotted fools! What can YOU do on \$13.50 a week— or thereabouts? MAYBE SOMEDAY YOU'LL GET AROUND TO DOING SOMETHING ABOUT IT!

John Blythe MICHEL

hear his tormentor say: "You'll never get work in my district... I'll tell everybody you are an ex-con man."

A smile played about Breadline's lips as he took his seat. He was thinking of hitting the cop with the steel bar and killing him.

"He's confessed," the foolish priest said, observing the smile on Breadline's face. "He's made his peace with God... God be praised... I see the smile of religion on his face..."

But Breadline never heard... He could only see the dead policeman at his feet.

William Allen WARD

Gauley Bridge

It heaves and it spars, but it does not punch. It might, though, pull a fast one and swipe us off our toes. The silicosed ghosts of Gauley Bridge, the dying spitting silicon, the daily tarred, whom they enrage, spur on the great phenomenon.

Harry BLOCK

Wars

Machine guns bit with teeth of steel
From common class they eat their meal
For wars are fought by damn fool asses
Who follow kings that rule the masses
With threat to the use of the iron heel.

William Allen WARD

Correspondence and Discussion

(Continued from Page 6.)

life, experiments and achievements, and would aid them to learn through the experiences and mistakes of other communes.

Through this strong bond we would know that the seekers after peace in this world do not stand alone, and this knowledge would strengthen our hands to continue in our humane undertaking.

We turn to you, comrades of the communes, and beg you to join us in establishing this bond. Write to us about your life, your aims, your organization; write to us as to your attitude towards the forming of this contact point. Send us the addresses of other communes in your country and other countries known to you. Help us in our enterprise.

If your hearts are for freedom, equality, and peace then you are our friends.

With greetings,

In the name of the Palestine Initiative Group,

J. Polmony,

In the name of the England Initiative Group,

E. Cockledge.

A Correction

The correction of my friend and comrade Wess* is accepted in the same kindly spirit that he made it. I was in this country during the world war and know the details of the split in the Freedom Group only as it was told me by Wess and Turner on one side and Keell on the other. I never agreed with Keell's attitude and he knew it but I could never think of him except as an honest man doing what he thought was right even though that thing was to me arbitrary and unfair. It was most unfortunate that Netlau should have reopened this old sore by calling and most unjustly, Kropotkin, the Tcherkesovs and others pro-war and my one reason for not offering a reply to the statement was a reluctance at this time to revise differences when anarchists and libertarians of all kinds should be trying to find ways and means to combat reaction and barbarism instead of fighting between themselves.

Harry KELLY.

* See December, 1938 issue.—Editor.

Financial Statement

Income from Groups:

Los Angeles Affair—\$19.64; Volonta Group (share of affair)—\$14.35; Chicago Group (share of affair)—\$5.00; Pro-buzhdania—\$4.50; Worcester Group, Mass (share)—\$4.00; Steubenville Group List—\$4.00; Nueva Era Group—\$4.00; Youth Group (raffle)—\$3.65; Youngstown Crop (through Berezo)—\$2.50; Radical Library—\$2.00; Allentown Group—\$1.00.

From Individuals:

Frank Notarstefano—\$3.50; Two Dollars: Monroe Bartlett; B. Capitano, John Faora, V. Sanazaro, A. Nardini, Paul Ravnenco, Celie Goldberg (newspaper sales); One Dollar: L. M. Rimbach, L. Botta, B. Trepano, H. Williams, L. Battaglio, The Hindustrian Newspapers (India), Anna Levin, S. Medinich, J. Silverstein, Manya Semenov, Arthur Wilson, Tony, (no Name (N. Y.)), H. Mathewson, Frank Catelano, G. Macrelli, Ethel Finkler, S. Polinow, H. W. Rockwell, Juliet Woodville, Ewing C. Baskette, Abruzzo. Fifty Cents: Raymers Old Book Store, Louis Greenberg, Walter Kemble. TOTAL INCOME: \$108.64

Balance on Hand: 19.51

Expenditures: \$106.48

Balance: \$21.67

MAN!

A monthly Journal of the Anarchist Ideal and Movement

MARCUS GRAHAM, Editor

Subscription Price: \$1.00 per year, Six months Fifty Cents.—Sample Copies Free Upon Request

MAN! invites the collaboration of all writers and artists who are in sympathy with our ideas to send us essays, poems, and drawings. No payment can be made. Where return of manuscript is desired sufficient postage should be included.

Administration and Editorial Address:

MAN!

P. O. Box 971 Los Angeles, Calif., U.S.A.

IN RETROSPECT OF CURRENT EVENTS

A Referendum on War?

It will be recalled that in the last Congress President Roosevelt succeeded in bringing about the defeat of the Ludlow amendment for a referendum on war. In the present Congress, Senator La Follette has brought up the issue once again. And it appears that President Roosevelt will again be responsible for the defeat of the new bill for a referendum on war.

With the European war scare terrifying the people and threatening to encircle the greater part of the world, it will be an easy task, indeed for Mr. Roosevelt, to succeed in bringing about the defeat of the La Follette war referendum bill. Naturally, the war mongers are Mr. Roosevelt's most proficient and reliable aides. Through the great medium of the radio, the bought speakers—in behalf of the merchants of death—are blurring out and shouting the most poisonous sort of jingoistic nationalism. Even Eleanor Roosevelt—the supposedly pacifist wife of the President—has joined the militarist band-wagon.

Mr. Roosevelt's objection to a war referendum is rather interesting and worthy of examination. Contentends he: "Our" form of "representative government" is well nigh sufficient to deal in its "traditional" manner with any war crisis that may arise.

From this sort of argumentation by Mr. Roosevelt, it becomes quite clear that whenever it suited his "benign royal highness" to damn "traditional" methods as a stumbling block in the path of his patching schemes of reform, he was unscrupulous to the nth degree. Now that a really important issue has arisen—an issue that will involve the lives and well-being of millions of people—Mr. Roosevelt brings forward the sacred cow of "traditionalism."

Of course, one might argue that "representative government"—if it means anything at all—can be best translated into terms of everyday life by giving the people who are expected to kill or be killed in the advent of war the right to voice their opinion before their government affords them this "grand opportunity" for murder. On this score one can point out that not long ago the Gallup poll showed that over 70% of the people were in favor of a referendum on war.

But this means very little to the President of these United States—the ruler of 130 million people! The chief concern of Mr. Roosevelt is to serve faithfully the interests of those predatory forces which rule not only our benighted United States but the rest of the world as well.

In pointing out how reactionary Roosevelt has proved himself to be, we must not forget that he is, according to his own repeated statements, a sworn upholder of the present capitalist system. And without standing armies to protect the imperialist conquests in times of peace and to prepare for new conquests, how can the system of capitalist plunder be perpetuated? No, Mr. Roosevelt has not changed. Rather, it is the naive people who saw in him a new savior who must come to their senses.

At the same time, it should not be assumed that a war referendum—were it to become the law of the land—would render this country immune from being dragged into a war in the interests of capitalism. The easily and rapidly concocted lies about the atrocities of the "enemy" would permeate the ether waves, fill the pages of the daily press and would be preached from the pulpits of religion. And before anyone would be able to counter-act such a campaign of falsehood, enough jingoistic sentiment could be stirred up to have the people vote favorably for any kind of war.

A referendum on war is not a solution to the problem. The easiest and shortest route to the stopping of war is to stop the manufacture of any and all war materials. However, when the people reach that point of understanding, they may even cease to produce for profit. That, of course, will imply an end to the capitalist system, the end of government and war. War, the by-product of capitalism, will have become a barbaric relic of the past.

If and when the people realize how easily they can solve all their problems—instead of entrusting their lives, well-being and happiness in the hands of political charlatans and religious peddlers, then we shall have an earthly paradise, a life of real peace and happiness—and not a life of fear, insecurity and misery in which we find ourselves.

Recognition of Franco, No Arms Embargo

During the last two years, President Roosevelt has been flooded with petitions signed by millions of people throughout the country. The signers of these petitions were not asking any favors of the head of our "great democracy." They were simply imploring him to live up to the International Law which grants any "legally constituted government" the right to purchase arms. They begged Mr. Roosevelt to lift the embargo on arms to Spain. Added to these mil-

lions of names were the pleas of leading men and women of letters in this country.

Apologists of the Roosevelt administration in the field of journalism have written all kinds of soothing stories in order to absolve the President. Each story announced that President Roosevelt was soon to lift the embargo on arms to Spain. Each time the wishful prophecies came to nought. But the apologists always found ample excuses with which to feed their gullible readers. Most of the time these servants of the pen hinted that the President was wholeheartedly in favor of lifting the embargo, but a few profascist low-ranking officials in the State Department prevented him from doing so....

The truth in this matter was most closely reached by the Washington staff correspondent of the "Christian Science Monitor." He frankly stated that it was the powerful influence of the Catholic Church which prevented the Roosevelt administration from acceding to the implorations of the millions of petitioners. This statement frankly and simply proved once again that the influence of the Roman papacy over our supposedly democratic government is by far more powerful than the petitioners ever suspected.*

It is an established fact that the Roosevelt administration never made an effort to deny the contention of the correspondent of the "Christian Science Monitor." At the same time, the Roosevelt regime, together with other "democracies" and Marxian ruled Russia, sold arms, munitions and provisions to fascist Italy and nazi Germany who, in turn, forwarded them to their henchman Franco.

By this action President Roosevelt left no doubt in the minds of critical observers that he is acting most consistently with his ideological claim to save the capitalist system of this country—and of the rest of the world. The pretentious liberal, labor, socialist and communist spokesmen who helped to re-elect Roosevelt simply closed their eyes and did not see what the administration was doing. Likewise, they closed their eyes to the fact that the infamous "Non-Intervention Committee" was the means through which the "democracies" and Bolshevik Russia facilitated the triumph of the hordes of Franco over the heroic sacrificing people of Spain.

If the blind leaders of the parties upholding the present administration still harbored any faith in the rulers in Washington, then this faith should have completely been shattered as a result of the declarations made by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull on April 1, 1939.

Mr. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, announced on that day that the U. S. has extended unconditional recognition to the Franco regime in Spain. And from his vacation retreat, President Roosevelt announced that he has signed a state document forthwith lifting the embargo on arms to Spain.

Arms to a people fighting for their social and political emancipation were forbidden by President Roosevelt. But arms for the usurper who is bent upon the re-introduction and the perpetuation of the old capitalist system of exploitation are immediately granted by the same Mr. Roosevelt. One is prompted to ask: Could anything more shameful or more heartless than this have been done by the president of "this land of the free"?

Will the millions of petitioners and the intellectuals of the country who implored the ruler of this land to sell arms to the fighting people of Spain realize that they have been morally slapped in the face and betrayed by the "democratic" pretensions of President Roosevelt? Will these betrayed men and women come forward and brand Mr. Roosevelt as the traitor and hypocrite he has proved himself to be? It remains to be seen.

As far as we are concerned, we never held any illusions about any or all of the "democracies"—and the Bolshevik state of Russia. We have, therefore, never aided or participated in the spectacle of petitioning. We have always kept ourselves aloof from any "united front" or "people's front" movements. We know only too well that it is naive and futile to expect "democracies" to help bring about the success of a revolutionary fighting people. On this ground, we could at no time see what good might come out of our uniting with any group, party or individual whose aims were anything but those of true social emancipation. Thus, our position of no compromise with the enemies of true Freedom is today, more than ever, justifiable and correct.

In recognizing the fascist bandit of Spain and in lifting the embargo on arms to this same regime of banditry, President Roosevelt has removed his pretentious cloak of the staunch fighter in behalf of any people struggling with the forces of reaction. He has revealed himself in his true spirit—a subservient tool in the interests of safeguarding and perpetuating the capitalist system on one hand and the superstitions and ignorance fostered by the Roman papacy on the other.

*How deeply the Roman papacy was interested in and worked for the crushing of the people's struggle for social liberation in Spain is best illustrated by the message of felicitation sent by the newly elected Pope—Pius the XII—to the victorious butcher Franco, and which our collaborator Ray Randall is quoting in the article "The Game of War" in this issue.

Spain's Refugees in France

The conservative and liberal press of the world have been carrying horrifying stories damning the French government for the maltreatment accorded the loyalists who fled from Spain after their leaders had betrayed and abandoned them.

What prompted the rulers of France to open its door to approximately 500,000 men and women is not difficult to divine. Having participated with the other "democracies" of the world in the deliberate and concerted conspiracy to bring about a victory for Franco rather than a victory of the revolutionary people, the rulers of France were undoubtedly well aware of the possibility that the butcher Franco—like the butcher Thiers who massacred 30,000 Communards of Paris in 1871—would not have refrained from indulging in the wholesale massacre of the 500,000 brave fighters. Fully aware of the possibility of so huge a massacre, the French rulers were far less concerned with the fate of the 500,000 men and women than with the fear of the consequences of such a massacre. The rulers of France feared that the slaughtering of 500,000 men and women who had bravely fought for the Social Revolution in Spain might have served as the kindling spark which would arouse an indifferent and misled world proletariat to so high a revolutionary pitch that the result might have been the end of the reign of terror and deceit by which all rulers have always succeeded in holding their reins of power. All in all, therefore, the "hospitality" accorded the fleeing betrayed fighters of Spain was far from being a gesture of humanness or generosity on the part of the French rulers. It was rather an act of self-defense whereby the status quo of the world's rulers might remain intact. Once this sinister purpose was achieved, the French rulers could no longer hide their true feelings against the half a million refugees. The real hospitality that awaited the heroic men and women coming from Spain was the set-up of barbed wire concentration camps.

SHELTER given the refugees can be best explained by one illustration. At St. Cyren, 75,000 men and women are forced to sleep on the open beach (during the winter days). In other places the refugees are forced to sleep in holes dug in the ground and cover themselves with the meager clothing they are wearing or with sheets of metal torn from abandoned cars.

FOOD. One loaf of bread was supplied for 25 people.

SANITATION. The "Sunday Express" of London reported that in a hospital holding 2,500 men, 1000 of whom are too ill to move, there are one basin, one bed-pan, two or three two-quart jugs for water, four doctors and eight nurses. One, then, can well imagine the sanitation facilities for those who are not sick.

The deliberate and inhuman maltreatment of these unfortunates can be explained only by the manner in which the French authorities have accorded the agents of Franco all possible facilities for carrying on recruitment among the refugees. The fact that many victims have preferred to return and face punishment under Franco rather than remain on French soil is proof enough of the kind of ordeals which the refugees are forced to undergo.

Yes, the cup of tragedy in the Spanish struggle is overflowing. It is a manifold series of tragedies—the tragedy of deceit at the hands of the loyalist spokesmen and government officials, the tragedy of what is being meted out to the refugees in France or what awaits them at the hands of the butcher Franco.

If the manner in which Barcelona fell—at the hands of its own leaders—was not enough of a tragedy of deceit, then the collapse and surrender of Madrid, Valencia and other parts of loyalist Spain is more than enough. If it should be proved true that the CNT joined Miaja in the last Defense Junta of Madrid, this will signify the actual moral suicide of the entire anarcho-syndicalist movement in Spain. At the same time, it will vindicate the true anarchist position which our comrades in Spain abandoned almost at the beginning of the struggle. It will reaffirm once again that anyone who enters the brothel of governmentalism ends up by prostituting oneself to this foul institution.

The situation which we are facing in the temporary end of the struggle in Spain is painful indeed. But serious and conscientious thinking prompts one to conclude that the lessons derived from the Spanish struggle—as costly as they may appear—will be of far-reaching importance in the future struggles of the oppressed of Spain as well as of the rest of the world.

The plight of the refugees in France, the manner in which Franco achieved his costly victory, the deceitful role played by the world democracies in making this victory possible, the bankruptcy of the compromising attitude of the socialists, communists, anarcho-syndicalists and anarchists in Spain—all these lessons, we hope, will not have been learned in vain.

M. G.